



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/073,881	05/06/1998	MAHENDRA S. RAO	T4903.CIP	1335

7590 08/18/2003

JANE MASSEY LICATA, ESQ.
LAW OFFICES OF JANE MASSEY LICATA
66 E. MAIN STREET
MARLTON, NJ 08053

EXAMINER

HAYES, ROBERT CLINTON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2003

29

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/073,881

Applicant(s)
Rao et al

Examiner
Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.

Art Unit
1647



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 11, 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 15, 17, and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 15, 17, and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed 6/11/03 has been entered.
2. The rejection of claims 1, 15 & 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is withdrawn after further consideration of that described in Example 18 in the instant specification, and Applicants' arguments.
3. Applicant's arguments filed 6/11/03 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.
4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 1, 15 & 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,589,376), and by Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,824,489), for the reasons made of record in Paper NOs: 11 (mailed 10/03/00), 21 (mailed 7/8/02) & 27 (mailed 3/11/03), and as follows.

Applicants argue on pages 10-12 of the response that "[n]either of the cited prior art patents teach harvesting of mammalian neuroepithelial stem cells by trypsinization **prior to**

Art Unit:

generation of the neural crest stem cells”, and that “[i]n contrast, the trypsinization step taught in the ‘489 Patent and the ‘376 Patent is performed after a 24 culture period and after the neural tube is carefully scraped away from the neural crest stem cells migrate (*sic*) onto the substrate. See specifically, Example 1...” of these patents. However, in contrast to Applicants’ assertions, whether trypsin is also used to “remove” “crest cells” is immaterial to what Anderson et al. describe in other sections of both their patents. *In arguendo*, even Example 1, lines 27-39 of col. 11, of ‘376 teach use of collagenase to harvest neuroepithelial stem cells (i.e., the “trypsinization” step), prior to differentiating these cells “after a 24 culture period” to neural crest stem cells, in which trypsin is also a well known collagenase that Anderson et al. further specifically describe (e.g., “col. 11, lines 49-53” of ‘376, as Applicants point out). Therefore, Applicants’ arguments are not persuasive, because the Anderson patents still teach all currently recited claim limitations, and for the reasons previously made of record.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit:

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Robert Hayes whose telephone number is (703) 305-3132. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, and alternate Fridays from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached on (703) 308-4623. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.
August 12, 2003



GARY KUNZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600